A U M

Depravities vanish from those who are ever wakeful.—DHAMMAPADA

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLII March, 1954 No. 5

THE POINT OF EGOITY

FOR every man there comes the time when he must stand entirely alone—when he can do nothing but apply the counsel of *Light on the Path*—"Hold fast to that which has neither substance nor existence." From the outlook of personal life, this is indeed a paradox —the soul finds itself severed from all objective relationships at a moment of supreme trial. Yet it is entirely reasonable that, in order to join in the universal fraternity of spirit, the soul has need of letting loose from every alliance of a material nature. It is, so to say, an irrefutable affirmation of the spiritual nature to find balance and security in "that which has neither substance nor existence."

There are endless trials of a preparatory and inferior character to acquaint the nascent spiritual ego with the nature of this ultimate decision. Every day a man must choose between self-reliance and dependence on some external authority. Every day he is called upon to distinguish between the *principle* of individual choice and the psychic habit of accepting a direction given by others.

The religious heritage of the West has the influence of obscuring when not altogether concealing the importance of these alternatives. Against the idea of spiritual egoity and self-reliance, traditional Christianity sets the notion of a supernatural "Saviour," a unique being whose ordeal on the cross is offered as a substitute for the trial of individual initiation. The man who accepts that substitute abrogates his own egoity. For long centuries, the West suffered intense indoctrination in the advantages of this substitution. Every device of fear and promise

of reward was employed to alienate human beings from the idea of their own potential divinity. There was endless persecution of the unbeliever in this world, and promise of eternal punishment for him in the next.

One could have no greater testament to the reality of the spiritual ego in man than the fact that, in spite of these many persuasions, there were enough hardy, self-reliant souls in the West to throw off the psychic and moral degradations of a millennium and to declare the independence of the human individual. This great resistance movement has since been identified, in its effects, as modern Materialism, but its genesis, like the genesis of true religion, was in the demand of the ego for recognition of its dignity and freedom. Then, in the nineteenth century, when the tide of positive inspiration in the scientific revolution was receding, soon to flow back into the swamps and stagnant pools of another kind of derogation of the human spirit—the identification of man with the animals, and all that goes with this soul-denying conception—the Founder of the Theosophical Movement entered the arena of modern thought. Now another and more far-reaching attempt was to be made to establish the reality of the spiritual nature of man. While the protagonists of both science and religion continued to squabble over the partisan issues which had developed during their long contest, H. P. Blavatsky sounded a new note of challenge. You fight, she said in effect, in an old battle which has lost its significance. The war between science and religion has become, she announced, merely a war of orthodoxies, the new against the old. With the help of a few others who caught a glimmer of what she meant, she established the Theosophical Society as the means to communicate with the Western world, although she knew, better than anyone else, the danger that even Theosophy, for all its knowledge of the nature of man and his spiritual self-existence, would fall into the hands of makers of Theosophical orthodoxy, developing its own conscious and unconscious betrayers of the message of spiritual freedom.

But, like the Founders of the American Republic, she sought to show Theosophists how to bring into being a *self-reforming* and *self-regenerating* institution. She saw that unless theosophists themselves could learn to distinguish between "membership" in the Society and the process of self-discovery which the Society was formed to aid, the Theosophical Movement would soon relapse into another conventional

form of religious belief, all the more insidious because of the flavor of "occultism" which would long linger in all nominal Theosophical associations.

The problem was to disclose both the relationship and the difference between cultural reform and individual progress in self-discovery. All that a teacher can do is establish the educational force of a cultural reform. But if the effort stops there, with the contribution of the teacher, the age-old tendency to accept a *substitution* for self-reliance sets in, and pursues its crystallizing and secularizing course even while echoing the sentiments of spiritual self-discovery.

There is, however, another aspect of the problem as stated. The course of egoic evolution begins at the psychic level and ends at the spiritual level. The process involves a kind of "weaning" of the disciple from his initial relationship of dependence upon a teacher. This growth into self-reliance can not be hastened, nor should it be delayed. It must, like every other growth-process in nature, proceed at its own pace; and since, in this case, the development relates to the assertion of the will of the individual rather than to the external laws of nature, the formation of the matrix for this growth requires profound and intimate knowledge of the cycles of human evolution.

The disciple has to in a sense emancipate himself from his teacher in order to join that teacher as a colleague. Yet this hardly puts the matter correctly, for the emancipation is not from the teacher himself, but rather from the inner sense of psychic dependence felt by the disciple in respect to the teacher. So stated, the equation is a fairly simple one. But against the background of the cultural environment and history, the role of other factors must be considered. The disciple is at the same time confronted by superficially similar psychic relationships which prevail between orthodox believers and the priests of religion. He is now obliged to distinguish again, this time between a natural psychic relationship and an unnatural and atavistic one. The criterion of decision has to be evolved by the disciple himself: he must himself be able to recognize that a natural psychic relationship, for human beings, is a relationship which continually grows less binding in terms of psychic dependence, and is progressively transformed into an alliance of manasic and spiritual beings. It is notable that, in this cycle of the Theosophical Movement, the "teachers" have only an *impersonal identity*—a fact of marked significance in relation to the question of

where the present generations of egos stand on the ladder of psycho-spiritual evolution. The implication is that they have reached a point where the matrix of initiation need not be "personal," but can be generalized as an environment of Higher Nature. It is also suggestive with respect to the educational wisdom of the Teachers of Theosophy.

Here, conceivably, we arrive at a working definition of the limit of help that can be obtained from the cultural reform established by teachers, by beings wiser and more advanced than ourselves. The remaining crucial steps of progress have to be taken by the disciples. The need is now for understanding of the true process of self-discovery. The work to be done, as always, involves the awakening of the intuition and the development of self-reliance. Part of the task brings an eternal watchfulness of the natural "gravitation" of the inner man. Is there an inclination to rely on "authority"? To feel very much "alone" when explanations we think necessary and in order are not forthcoming?

To what extent, in our reflections, does the course of our lives seem to depend upon what others may do? Do we turn to others for light, or for comfort and assurance in moments of desperation? Is our courage borrowed from the indomitable strength, or what we think to be the indomitable strength, of others?

Or, to turn the situation about, does the liberation we seek seem to depend upon severing some tie of now regretted personal dependence? Are we "proud" of our new-born independence—a self-reliance which recoils from even the counsel and mutual regard which once seemed so important to us—too important, perhaps?

In either case, the psychology is personal in origin, the decisive forces psychic, not spiritual or egoic.

It is hard, sometimes, to realize, that when emotions of this sort hold sway, we are indeed at the place where we must learn to hold fast to that which has neither substance nor existence. It is then that no one can help us, when the soul must speak in the soul's authentic accents, or we shall fail and fall back to some lower level of psychic security, and have to start the slow climb to egoity once again. Such decisions come to us, not once or twice, but again and again, until, at last, a crucial moment of choice presents itself.

LIVING THE HIGHER LIFE

[The title as well as the substance of this article serves the Theosophical student as appropriate reminder of William Quan Judge's place in the Theosophical Movement. Judge, said H.P.B., was "the Antaskarana between the two *Manas (es),* the American thought and the Indian,—or rather the trans-Himalayan esoteric knowledge." His writings also constituted a bridge between lofty metaphysics, abstract doctrines, and the daily life of the would-be disciple of Wisdom Religion. "Living the Higher Life" first appeared in two sections in Mr. Judge's *Path* magazine, and has been three times reprinted in THEOSOPHY. Since Mr. Judge's death, on March 21, 1896, there have always been those who determined, especially in the month of his passing, that his philosophy, counsel and example should remain alive in the hearts of his friends.

The psychologic scope of "Living the Higher Life" is truly enormous, however simple the language. We have here a view of many natural human ideals, not set off against each other as either "superior" and "inferior," but rather presented in synthesis. A particular sort of "family life" is seen in karmic perspective, as opportunity, obligation—and also as a transition towards another state of mind wherein one's concerns become broader, the range of comprehension greater. So with community and national patriotism—so, even, perhaps, with the chiefly meditative life itself. This too must ultimately be meant to "become a part of something else," not constitute an end in itself. So too with William Q. Judge. Everything in his life, we may surmise, was part of a transition towards higher synthesis, and it was this spirit which he breathed into the work of the Theosophical Society of the last century.—Eds.]

"I have no desire for any other line of life; but by the time I had awakened to a knowledge of this life, I found myself involved by circumstances against which I do not rebel, but out of and through which, I am *determined* to work, neglecting no known duty to others."

—*Letter from a Friend*

THE "Dweller of the Threshold" which stares even advanced occultists in the face and often threatens to overwhelm them, and the ordeals of Chelaship or of probation for Chelaship, differ from each other only in degree. It may not be unprofitable to analyze this Dweller and those ordeals. For our present purpose, it is enough to state, that they are of a triune nature and depend upon these three relations: (1) to our nationality; (2) to our family; and (3) to

ourselves. And every one of these three relations is due to the assertion of a portion of our own past Karma, that is to say, to its effects.

Why should we be born in a particular nation and in a particular family? Because of the effect of a particular set of our Karmic attractions, which assert themselves in that manner. I mean that one set of our past Karmas exhaust themselves in throwing us in our present incarnation amidst a particular nation, another set introducing us into a particular family; and a third set serving to differentiate or individualize us from all the other members of the nation or of the family. One of our Eastern proverbs says: "the five children of a family differ like the five fingers of a hand." Unless we look at this difference from this standpoint, it must always appear to us a riddle, a problem too difficult to solve, a mystery, in short, why children born of one family, while they have some traits common to all, should still appear to differ vastly from one another. What applies to the family applies also to the nation, of which families are but units; and also to mankind as a whole, of whom nations are but families or units. The only way to decide the great question of the age, whether the laws of nature are blind and material, or spiritual, intelligent and divine, is, it seems to me, to point out in connection with every subject, the absolutely intelligent and divine manner in which these laws act, and how they force us to realize the economy of nature. This is the only way by which we could become spiritual; and I would, once for all, call upon my co-workers for the cause, to realize at every step of their study, as far as possible, the Divine Intelligence thus manifesting itself. Otherwise, how much soever you might believe or take it for granted, that the forces that govern the universe are spiritual, the belief, however deep rooted it might appear, would be of little use to you when you have to pass through the ordeals of Chelaship; and then you are sure to succumb and exclaim that the "Law is blind, unjust and cruel," especially when your selfishness and personality overwhelm you. When once a practical occultist and a learned philosopher met with, what seemed to him a "serious calamity and trial," in spite of himself he exclaimed to me frankly: "the law of Karma is surely blind, there is no God; what better proofs are needed?" So deep-rooted in human nature is infidelity and selfishness; no one need therefore to be sure of his own spiritual nature. No amount of lip learning will avail us in the hour of need. We have to study the law in all its aspects and assimilate to

our highest consciousness,—that which is called by Du Prel super sensuous consciousness—all the data which go to prove and convince us that the Power is spiritual. Look around and see whether any two persons are absolutely identical, even for a time. How intelligent must be the power that ever strives to keep each and every one of us totally different *on the whole,* while if analyzed, we possess some traits in common, even with the Negro, with whom we are remotely allied.

In this connection I shall refer you to a passage in the article on "Chelas and Lay Chelas" (vide column 1, page 11 of "Supplement to the Theosophist" for July, 1883): "The Chela is not only called to face all latent evil propensities of his nature, but in addition, the whole volume of maleficent power accumulated by the community and nation to which he belongs * * until the result is known." I shall only ask you to apply the same principle to your family relations affecting your present incarnation. Thus seven things are found to secure us a victory, or a sad, inglorious defeat in the mighty struggle known as the Dweller of the threshold and the ordeals of Chelaship: (1) The evil propensities common to ourselves and to our family; (2) those common to ourself and our nation; (3) those common to ourself and to mankind in general, or better known as the weakness of human nature, the fruits of Adam's first transgression; (4 to 6) the noble qualities common to us and to these three; (7) the peculiar way in which the 6 sets of our past Karmas choose or are allowed to influence us now, or their effects in producing in us the present tendency. The adept alone can take the seventh or last mentioned item completely into his own hands; and every mortal who would, as I have since recently begun to reiterate, direct all his energies to the highest plane possible for him ("Desire always to attain the unattainable"—says the author of "Light on the Path"),—such a mortal, too, could more or less do the same thing as the adept, insofar as he acts up to the rule. Every Chela, and also those who have a desire to be Chelas even, as they suppose secretly, have to do with the first six propensities or influences.

The world is inclined—at least in this Kali Yuga (the Dark Age)—always to begin at the wrong end of anything and direct all its faculties to the perception of effects and not of their causes. So the ideas of "renunciation," "asceticism" and of the "true feeling of universal Brotherhood" (or "mercy," as I call it, in accordance with South Indian Ethics), all of which are compatible with Gnanis, or the most exalted

of Mahatmas, all these have come to be recognized by all our Theosophists, in general, as *the means* of progress for a beginner; while the real means of progress for us mortals—duties to our own families and to our own nation, or "kindness" and "patriotism" in the highest and ethical sense of the terms—are discarded. True, from the standpoint of a Jivanmukta, a true friend of humanity, these two Sadhanas are really "selfishness"; still, until we attain that exalted state, these two feelings should be made the ladders for raising ourselves, the means of not only getting ourselves rid of our family defects and natural idiosyncrasies, but also of strengthening in ourselves the noble qualities of our families and of our nation. Until we reach that ideal state where the blessed soul has to make neither good nor bad Karma, we must strive to be constantly doing "good" Karma, in order that we might become Karma-less (nish Karmis).

Let it not be understood at all, that I mean by "family duties" and "national duties," false attachments to the family or to the nation. Family duty consists not in sensuality or pleasure-hunting, but in cultivating and in elevating the emotional nature (the fourth principle), of ourselves and of our family, in being equally "kind," not only to the members of the family, but also to all creatures, and in enjoying all such pleasures of the family life as are consistent with the acquirement of "wealth" (all the means necessary for the performance of Dharma or whole duty) according to the teachings of Valluvar, and in utilizing such pleasures and means for the performance of our duty to our nation. Patriotism consists similarly in theosophising our own nation, in not only getting ourselves rid of our national defects, as well as other members of the nation rid of the same, but also in strengthening in ourselves and in our nation as a whole, all the noble qualities which belong to our nation; in the enjoyment of the privileges* of the nation and using them as a means for the performance of *Dharma.* If family duties are taken due care of, our duties to the nation and to humanity would, to a great extent, take care of themselves unimpeded. Our national duties, if strictly performed, serve to purify our fifth lower principle of its dross and to establish and develop the better part of it, while the performance of our duty to Humanity or the *realization of universal tolerance and mercy,* purifies the lower (human) stuff in

* I use this word "privilege" in its ethical sense; privileges are to the patriot what the "pleasures" are to the family life.

the fifth higher principle and makes it divine, thus enabling us to free ourselves gradually from the bonds of ignorance common to all human beings.

The above assertions, might, at first sight, seem rather bold and untheosophical. But I should venture to state my conviction that the whole edifice of Aryan religions and Aryan philosophy is based upon these principles, and that, on a careful consideration of the subject, the great importance attached to household life (Grihasta ashrama) in that philosophy, would be fully borne out. To my mind no ascetics, no teachers of mankind, however eminent and full of the highest knowledge, are really such good and practical benefactors of humanity as Valluvar, of ancient times, who incarnated on earth for the express purpose, among others, of setting an example of an ideal household life to mortals who were prematurely and madly rushing against the rocks of renunciation, and of proving the possibility of leading such a life in any age however degenerated; or as Ráma, who, even after having become an *avatar-purusha,* came down amidst mortals and led a household life.

It has often been contended that the world has not progressed on *the path,* because *gnanis,* or Mahatmas, have dwindled in their number and greatness, and because it is Kali Yuga, or the dark age, now. Such arguments are due to our mistaking the effects for their causes. The only way to prepare the way for the advent of a favorable Yuga and for the increase of the number and greatness of Mahatmas, is to establish gradually the conditions for the leading of a true household life. I should unhesitatingly state, that that is the duty of earnest Theosophists and real philanthropists.

Is it not conceded by all philanthropists that unselfish labors for humanity can alone relieve us from the ocean of Sainsara (Rebirth), develop our highest potentialities and help us to alchemise our human weakness? Applying the same principle to unselfish discharge of our family and national duties, my position becomes tenable. A Mahatma has, it appears, declared that He has still "patriotism." But He has not said nor would say, that He has still family "attachments." This proves that He has got out of the defects of the family to which He belongs, while He is only striving to get out of national defects, some of which at any rate cling to Him. A Buddha would say, that He has "mercy," but no "patriotism."

The only effectual way to get out of family defects is to discharge all our duty to our family before leaving it, as ascetics, or before we die. Blessed is he* who, in each of his incarnations, *then and there,* gets rid of the defects of the family into which he is ushered, thereby converts those defects in his parents, brothers and sisters, into noble qualities, thus strengthening and developing the good qualities both of himself and of his family, then strives to be born in the same family again and again, until he himself becomes a Buddha and assists his family to become a family fit for a Buddha to be born into, while he becomes the cream of all the noble qualities of the family without being tainted with its idiosyncrasies. A Dugpa (Black Magician) is frequently born in the same family and becomes the cream of all its evil propensities. Here again is the operation of the sublime and divinely intelligent law of universal and natural economy asserting itself. This is beautifully allegorized in the story of a Jivanmukta churning out of the ocean the elixir of life, and leaving the *visha* (the poison, all the evil propensities) for the Dugpas. This is one of the meanings of the allegory. Avoiding all personalities and questionable facts, I shall rely solely upon our Puranas and scriptures to prove that in every family where Adepts and Gnanis are (or choose to be) frequently born, often Dugpas are also born, as a matter of course. Krishna was the greatest of Gnanis and his uncle, Kansa (for our present purpose), was a terrible Dugpa. The five Pandavas had a hundred wicked cousins, the Kauravas. Devas and the whole brood of wicked Asuras were born of the same parent. *Vibhishana* had for his brother, *Ravana* the prince of Dugpas; so had the good Sugriva a brother like Vali. Prahlada had a monster for his father.

Take the case of one who has not done all his duty to his family, before he dies, or before he takes the vows of renunciation and becomes an ascetic. Such ascetics find themselves attracted by the family defects and selfishness of themselves (which hitherto perhaps lay more or less dormant and now become kindled and awakened by the selfishness of the relatives) and are disturbed in the performance of the duties of their new order or *Ashrama,* however unselfish their relatives might have been "unconsciously" or unintentionally. In spite of themselves these relatives arrest the progress of the ascetics in whom the family

* This is the man to be in the family and not of the family like the water on the lotus leaf, making only the good traits of the family the seat of his higher self.

defects become thus strengthened and developed. Such is the mysterious law of attraction. This man must be born again (1) either in the same family, with the family defects strengthened, both in himself and in his family; (2) or in another family. In the first case, the noble qualities of the family are not strengthened and therefore gradually disappear both from him and from the family. In the second case, he becomes an undutiful son, brother or husband, in his new family, firstly because of the natural law of repetition, which, with the terrible Karmic interest, strengthens the tendency in him to disregard duty; secondly because of the "counter family attractions" (or repulsions). Let not this unfortunate wanderer from the post of his family duty console himself with the foolish idea that this tendency would confine its havoc to family traits (good and evil) and to family duties alone. It would extend itself in all directions, wherever it can; it would make him disregard his duties to his nation and to himself (or in other words, to humanity). He would suddenly be surprised to find himself apathetic to his nation and to his highest nature, or to mankind. Such are the mazes and unknown ramifications of our evil or good propensities. Any evil or noble element of human nature converts itself, under "favorable" conditions into any other element however apparently remote. The conditions are there ready wherever the element is strong; where there is a will there is a way. Performance of family duties therefore develops patriotism and mercy.

I do not at all mean to say that the effects of Karma *always* assert themselves in the same shape or form; but they often might and do. Nor do I mean that the affinities above stated, blossom and ripen in the incarnation immediately succeeding; they might develop ten or even one hundred incarnations after; but in such a case, the Karma only accumulates enormous interest. The affinities might not develop *at the same time* in both him and her, who was once his wife; if they did at the same time, the account could be easily settled,—otherwise, woe to him and her! Supposing that the attractions for him are developed in her, while the attachments for her are not developed in him at the same time; the result might be, that she pines and languishes for him, sends her poisonous darts consciously or "unconsciously" against him; if these arrows do not kindle the corresponding nature in him, for the time being they frustrate his achievements in other directions. Supposing by the time the affinities in him are developed, he becomes an initi-

ate and she becomes, (let us suppose) his pupil (male or female). If at the time the pupil's affinities have become converted into devotion for the initiate, the latter becomes blinded in his philanthropic work and noble duties of a sage, and commits, through the infatuation of a love for the pupil, serious blunders, which result in a catastrophe to both of them and to humanity: and both the pupil and initiate fall down and have to mount their rugged pathway again with increased difficulties in their way.

Once, in an age and in a country, when and where household life continues to be ideal, one single wretch commits the first act of transgression by impetuously rushing into the circle of ascetics, or by dying before wholly discharging his duty to his family, the natural result is that both himself, his family, and his nation, become thereby seriously affected. The Akasa* becomes affected by the impulse to transgress in this direction; this impulse forces itself gradually (with accumulated interest, redoubled force) upon others; the ignoble example becomes a precedent; other cases of a like nature follow in quick succession. In course of time, (just when a sad descending cycle begins, such is the divine intelligence of the law that economizes energies and makes things fit it) the leading of the ideal family life becomes almost impossible and very rare; the whole community is thus ruined. Learned and great adepts return to other spheres (where there then is an ascending cycle) and leave the nation to be swallowed by a cataclysm after ages of degradation and vice.

Let us now reverse this case, and suppose that in the most degenerate nation, in the darkest of cycles, one philanthropist becomes unselfish and intelligent enough to set a noble and intelligent example by fulfilling all family duties; then, as naturally as in the preceding case, the precedent gradually gains acceptance; the way is paved for the advent of an ascending cycle; Gnanis bless the noble man and come down from other unfavorable spheres, where descending cycles begin to dawn.

Now it may be easy to understand why Chelas and lay Chelas (who have not yet thrown off their family defects and thus become the cream of their family's good qualities) are told to be careful lest they become Dugpas (Black Magicians).

---

* The Ether, the Astral Light.—[Ed.]

I will ask you to apply the same kinds of arguments to the necessity for performing (and the failure to perform) our duties to our nation and to mankind. You can see that the phenomena of heresy, downfall of religions, rise of new religions, the birth in Europe of a Max Müller, who expatiates upon the greatness of the Vedic philosophy, and Bradlaughs and other infidel sons of Christian parents—all these are due to the fact (and also to other causes), that the individuals concerned had not in some one or other of their past incarnations, done their duty to the nations (or religions), to which they respectively belonged. A study of the times when and in the manner in which the traits of these men are brought into play should be profitable in several ways. Extending the analogy, it may be said that heartlessness, murder, cannibalism, etc., are due to failure to discharge, in past incarnations, one's duty to humanity (that is to one's self).

In conclusion it might be added that the most important element in the "Dweller of the Threshold," and in the ordeals of Chelaship, is family defects, which ought to be *first* "conquered"; then in order come national defects and the "diseases of the flesh" in general. Though all these three have to be got rid of simultaneously as far as possible, and all the three kinds of duties performed, still beginners should pay more attention to the first than to the second, and more to the second than to the third, and none of these neglected.

In those happy Aryan ages, when Dharma was known and performed fully, those men and women who did not marry, remained in the family for performing their family duties and led a strictly ascetical and Vedantic life as Brahmacharis and Kannikas (or virgins). Those alone married, who were in every way qualified for leading a grihasta (household) life. Marriage was in those days a sacred and religious contract, and not at all a means of gratifying selfish desires and animal passions. These marriages were of two kinds: (1) Those who married for the express purpose of assisting each other (husband and wife) in their determination to lead a higher life, in fulfilling their family duties, in enjoying all pleasures enjoined for such a life and thereby acquiring the means for attaining the qualifications for higher ashrama of renunciation (Sannyása), and, above all, for giving the world the benefit of children, who would become gnanis and work for humanity. Such a husband and wife might be regarded as not having in their previous incarnations been able enough to become ripe for Chelaship.

(2) Those who had, in their past incarnations already fitted themselves completely for entering the sanctuary of Occultism and gnana marga (path of wisdom). One of them, the Pati (the master or "husband") was the Guru who had advanced far higher than his Patin (co-worker or pupil or "wife"). As soon as the alliance between them was made, these retired into the forest to lead the life of celibacy and practical Occultism. But, before so retiring, they had invariably promised to their parents and other members of their family to assist and elevate them even from a distance and offered to periodically adjust* the inner life of all the relatives. I quote the language generally used in making such promises: "Whenever mother, father, sister and brothers, any of you think of me in your hour of need, wherever or whatever I may be, I solemnly promise to lend you a helping hand."

Needless to say, that such vows were conscientiously kept, and that those who were not really able to do so never made such promises nor retired from the side of their family, but chose to belong to the first class of married people. This second class of persons who thus retired into the forest and became hermits, were called Vanaprasthas. They always obtained the full consent† of their near relatives and renounced "pleasures" and material prosperity (money making, etc.).

The fourth highest order of life was complete renunciation (Sannyasis). These were the blessed few who had, then and there, in each incarnation, got out of family defects. Only those *were* admitted into this order whom the defects of no family could affect. Long before their admission into this order, they had, by fulfilling family duties, successively, incarnation after incarnation gone far beyond the reach of family defects. Brahmacharis and Kannikas could, after they had discharged family duties, become Sannyasis. All except those belonging to the second order of life, were called upon and did take a vow to give up one or more of their dearest and strongest defects.

Such, my friends, were the Laws of Manu. If any of you could establish a community on a better foundation, I should be happy to

---

* I use the word in the peculiar sense which I have already attached to it.

† "Full consent" including the consent of all their various consciousnesses. If the Patin or Pati saw, and they ought to be able to see, that even in one of the consciousnesses of any of their near relatives there lurked a latent spark of hesitation to consent or of unwillingness, then the pair unselfishly gave up their determination to become Vanaprasthas and remained with the family until the proper time came.

give up my allegiance to the great Sage, Saviour, and Legislator. As every Manu establishes the same Manava Dharma again and again, and as the Manus are higher than Buddha and other founders of religions, I should call upon you to pay all possible attention to this subject. Manu is higher, because he overshadows a Buddha.

I must request the readers, to study every word and the whole of this paper (if it deserves to be so called) and not tear it piece-meal or interpret passages and phrases in it, as they please. I must add, that by "family duties" I do not at all mean sacrificing your duty or conviction and Truth, to gratify the whims or selfish nature or sectarian views of any of your "relatives." But I use the expression "family duties" in a peculiar sense, namely, "that course and *only that course* of action, speech and thoughts by which you can not only get rid of your family defects in this very incarnation, but also strengthen in yourself all the noble qualities of your family, and which will at the same time enable your relatives (parents, brothers, sisters, wife, children, etc.,) also to get rid of *the same* defects and strengthen in themselves *the same* good qualities—so that you might be born again and again in the same family." "Patriotism" is used in a similar manner; and the article "Elixir of Life" (see *Theosophist*) should be read in the light of this paper. [Reprinted THEOSOPHY: 37, three installments.]

The question is asked, "Has the dweller of the threshold an objective form; upon what does its objective form depend; does it always appear to everyone in the same form as it did to Glyndon in Bulwer's story?"

It is objective to those who have gone very far.

It depends upon (1) a certain thing I shall not here name; (2) the stage of development to which the chela or occultist has attained or is near attaining; (3) the mode of regarding elementals and the Dweller, peculiar to the chela or occultist, to his family and to his nation, or rather to the national and family legends or religion; (4) which form, more or less monstrous or incongruous, would be most frightful and overpowering to him at the critical period. Subject to the above four conditions, the Dweller assumes a form according to the manner in which the chela or occultist *has or has not fulfilled the threefold duties,* and according to the manner in which the sevenfold elements of the Dweller assert themselves upon him. The better he has fulfilled the threefold duties, the less does the Dweller affect him. Of course the form is not necessarily the same for everyone.

Why did the Dweller appear to Glyndon's sister, who was not undergoing probation, and why in the same form?

Because she was sympathetic and sensitive enough. The principle involved in this case is the same as in obsession.

The Dweller might either be but one elemental, or a group or several groups of elementals assuming one collective form. It is one elemental, when the crisis comes at the very commencement of the chela's or occultist's attempt to elevate his lower nature. This is the case when he has the least (Karmic) stamina for the "uphill path." The later on his path is waylaid, the more numerous are the elementals of which the Dweller is composed.

It need not be imagined that this appearance or influence confronts the chela only once until he reaches the first initiation, and an initiate only once during the interval between two initiations. It appears as often as the stock of his Karmic stamina falls below the minimum limit.

By Karmic stamina is meant the *phala* (effect or fruit) of past unselfish, good Karma that has become ripened. Though the occultist might have an immense quantity of past unselfish good Karma stored up, still, if during his crisis there be not a sufficient number of present unselfish good thoughts to ripen a sufficient portion of that quantity, he finds himself destitute of the necessary stock of stamina. Few are they who have already laid up a good quantity of unselfish good Karma; and fewer still are they who have the requisite degree of unselfish and spiritual nature during the period of trial; and there are still fewer who would not rush for further Yoga development, without having all the requisite means.

When not qualified fully for it, we ought to and could go on developing ourselves in the ordinary way, and try to secure the necessary means by leading an unselfish life and setting an example to others, and this is the stage of nearly all ordinary Theosophists. They, in common with all their fellows, are influenced by a "Dweller," which is the effect upon them of their own, their family, and national defects; and although they may never, in this life, see objectively any such form, the influence is still there, and is commonly recognized as "bad inclinations and discouraging thoughts."

Seek then, to live the Higher life by beginning now to purify your thoughts by good deeds, and by right speech.

THE CARTESIAN DEVIL

THE Cartesian devil, or "bottle-imp," as it is commonly called, owes its origin to René Descartes, the French philosopher of the seventeenth century. This philosophical toy is described as "a hollow figure partly filled with air, and immersed in water in a glass jar, the jar being provided with an elastic cover, by pressure upon which the immersed figure is made to sink, rising again when the pressure is removed."

The bottle-imp was used to illustrate the principle of specific gravity. But if we alchemize the physical-plane symbol and transmute its lesson into a principle of philosophy, we may say: The bottle-imp in man is also hollow—partly filled with suspicions, fears, and imaginings; immersed in the psychic nature of his personality (the personality being provided with an elastic cover, by pressure upon which due to circumstances, events, or dealings with fellow-men) the "imp" is made to rise and sink in accordance with the pressure exerted.

Almost every man, it is said, has his bottle-imp, or devil. It is some inner psychic fault, some personal idea, some tender spot in one's nature, which rises and sinks, throwing up clouds of illusion which blind the one true sight. With one man, it might be some deep-seated fear; with another envy, suspicion, or jealousy. It might be desire for personal recognition which one thinks is not accorded by his friends; or perhaps it is a subtle ambition for position. In any case, it is a constant source of irritation, a veritable devil, which misses no opportunity to get in its devious work.

Might it be that when things go wrong continually, or when pressure seems unbearable, it is solely because there exists within some *undiscovered* bottle-imp? The pressure of circumstance or of work, and the doings of those around us will not account for all that is wrong. There is also that inside devil, who rises and sinks at the slightest degree of pressure upon the elastic covering of personality. Looking outward for the source of the trouble, we say, "Things are not as they should be," blaming other people for our difficulties. We think that those around us have designs against us, and consequently we are suspicious of everything that they do. And we constantly imagine ourselves "mistreated."

Each man's bottle-imp must be peculiar to himself, something which he alone can discover and remove. Deep down in the nature the obnoxious little fellow hides, continually throwing up bubbles. What then is the remedy?

Is it not simply that I go to work upon myself? No amount of kicking against the pricks, or of complaining, or of attempting to change other people, or of trying to make externals fit in with my distorted view of things (it must be distorted, so long as this bottle-imp remains) will be of avail. The situation looks unsolvable so long as I look without. But, looking within, it is so simple. The whole of my trouble is to be traced to that one little Cartesian devil, whom I have allowed to remain, and who has the power to color and distort everything that happens. He makes me take everything that another person says or does in the wrong way. At the slightest degree of pressure upon my personality, he rises up and disfigures the meanings of things. He has the power to cause an almost perfect condition to seem unbearable. He even makes me ungrateful for what I have, and ingratitude is a crime in Occultism. So long as he remains, things, I know, will continue to go wrong—so I shall endeavor to walk away and leave him behind.

THE PERMANENT ETHICAL SENSE

The "realists" assure us that the problem of ethics is a relic of the past. They tell us that psychological or sociological analysis shows that all values are only relative to a given culture. They propose that our personal and social future is guaranteed by our material effectiveness alone. But these "realists" are ignorant of some hard facts. They do not see that the emptiness and planlessness of individual life, that the lack of productiveness and the consequent lack of faith in oneself and in mankind, if prolonged, results in emotional and mental disturbances which would incapacitate man even for the achievement of his material aims.

—ERICH FROMM

THE WAITING VEHICLE

"If I was asked what is the greatest treasure which India possesses, and what is her finest heritage, I would answer unhesitatingly it is the Sanskrit language and literature and all it contains."

—PANDIT NEHRU

SANSKRIT is the vehicle of *evolved* human thought, the philosophical and scientific language of the future. Today, as throughout the past, it is unknown and unspoken in its true systematized form except by the Initiates, as it is pre-eminently a mystery language. To the Kabiri, or Titans, is ascribed the invention of letters—the *Devanagari*—or the alphabet and language of the gods; Devanagari being the letters or characters of the Sanskrit language. Real Devanagari, non-phonetic characters—meant formerly the outward symbols, the signs used in the intercommunication between the gods and initiated mortals. The Kabiri, "great and powerful gods," are in their original divine characters the beneficent Entities who, *symbolized in Prometheus,* brought light to the world, and endowed humanity with intellect and reason. They were our first instructors. Hermes, Orpheus, Cadmus, Asclepios, all these demi-gods and heroes, said to have appeared as the benefactors of men and to whom is ascribed the revelation of sciences to man, are all generic names of the Kabiri. They are the Dhyan Chohans who once were men like ourselves, products of evolution.

Evolution for this period, it is taught, began millions and millions of years ago, succeeding a vast period of darkness or hibernation. And preceding that period of sleep there were eternally other periods of activity or manifestation. Now, in these prior periods of energy and action the same evolutionary progress went on, from and out of which came great beings—men perfected and become what to us are gods, who had aided in countless evolutions in the eternal past. These became Dhyan Chohans, and took part in all succeeding evolutions. Such is the great goal for all human souls to strive after. Of the Dhyan Chohans and the Mahatmas we may know something, and are often given, as it were, tangible proof of their existence. For the Adepts are living men, using bodies similar to our own; they are scattered all

---

NOTE.—Collated mainly from Theosophical sources.

over the earth in all nations, all knowing each other. They have times when they meet together and are presided over by some among their number who are more advanced in knowledge and power than the rest; and these higher Adepts have their communications, at which the One who presides is the highest: from these latter begins the communication with the Dhyan Chohans. . . .

From these "gods" descended to present man of the Fifth race, as to his forebears, the language of the gods—Sanskrit. It is very easy to see that the imperishable doctrine had to be filtered down through various channels. The communicator of it to mortals would be regarded by his finite auditors as a god. The same method is observable in the *Gita* (chapter four), where Krishna says to Arjuna that "this never-failing doctrine I formerly taught to Vivaswat and he to Manu, who told it to Ikshwaku, succeeding whom came the Rajarshees who studied it." No human language save the Sanskrit can adequately render into a European tongue the grand panorama of the ever periodically recurring Law. It will one day be again the language used by man upon this earth, first in science and in metaphysics, and later on in common life. Terms now preserved in that noblest of languages will creep into the literature and press of the day, crop up in reviews, appear in various books and treatises. The language will be one which is scientific in all that makes a language, and has been enriched by ages of study of metaphysics and the true sciences.

The same is said of the return of Latin and Greek: there will be a time when the Greek of Æschylus, and far more perfect still in its future form—will be spoken by all in Southern Europe; during which time Sanskrit will be resting in its periodical *Pralaya;* and Attic Greek will be followed by the Latin of Vergil. Latin and Greek, perfected and finished as they are, and therefore models for our imitation and emulation in the perfecting of our use of our own tongue, are but shadows of the noble Sanskrit, the perfection of language of the past Race, embodying in it all former perfections since the beginning of speech upon the earth. For Sanskrit, in the days when it was a living tongue, was also the living vehicle of thought. Its sounds, the *active* phase of language, were so entirely the vehicle of meaning, that they conveyed their own definition, and immediately induced in the mind of the listener the exact modification, that is—the *exact state of being* of the speaker. Misunderstanding of one by another, so universally

common and unavoidable in our times, was then unknown, for language was the living antaskarana of thought or ideation. The listener not only heard sounds and words: he heard, saw, felt, what was taking place in the mind of the speaker, as if it was himself.

The vast number of roots common to both Latin and Greek were present in the Pelasgian tongues. The latter were of a language with the same, and even stronger roots than the Greek. This was their common ancestor, the "language spoken at one time by all the nations of Europe—before their separation." The Pelasgians were one of the root-races of future Greece, and were a remnant of a sub-race of Atlantis.

In the Sanskrit, as also in the Hebrew and all other alphabets, every letter has its occult meaning and its *rationale;* it is a cause and an effect of a previous cause, and a combination of these very often produces magical effects. The vowels, especially, contain the most occult and formidable potencies. The Mantras—esoterically magical rather than religious—are chanted by the Brahmans and so are the Vedas and other scriptures. The literal meaning of the fourth Veda, the Atharva, is "magic incantation, containing aphorisms, incantations, and magical formulae." As said in *The Secret Doctrine:* "To pronounce a word is to evoke a thought and make it present; the magnetic potency of the human speech is the commencement of every manifestation in the Occult World." The Sanskrit letters of the Devanagari are 63 in number. They are all musical and are read, or rather chanted, according to a system given in very old Tantra works. And since each answers to a numeral, and has therefore a far larger scope for expression and meaning, it must necessarily follow that Sanskrit is far more perfect and far older than other languages which *followed the system,* but could apply it only in a limited way.

For a language so old and so perfect as Sanskrit to have survived alone, among all languages, it must have had its cycles of perfection and its cycles of degeneration. It has its special purposes in the reign of immutable cyclic laws, and is now slowly spreading in Europe and will one day have the extension it had thousands upon thousands of years back—that of a universal language.

The question naturally arises, would a substitute universal language be of absolute benefit to the world today? While it is true that a universal language would be a good thing, it is also true that the average

level of intelligence is low and that a highly cultivated person is far above the average. The universal tongue would have to be limited to the whole level of the mediocre average so as to be understood by all—or else the cultured ones would have to deal in another set of terms to express their higher ideas; this would be tantamount to a newer language than the first, and so on *ad infinitum.* When however, the race is entirely lifted up to a right level of moral condition, character, aspiration, and ideal, then we will be ready to have a universal tongue.

Unquestionably, as the change in the Buddhi and Manas of the race proceeds, more and more of the race will begin to talk on a higher plane. There are persons who never think with the higher faculties of their mind at all; those who do so are the minority and are thus, in a way, *beyond,* if not above the average of mankind. Those will think even upon ordinary matters on a *higher* plane. And thus will the structure of language and the meanings of words be brought to achieve a higher level. By this means will Sanskrit eventually come to be "again the language used by man upon this earth." And, accomplishing the revivification of the "language of the gods" will come also the realization of one of the Objects of the Theosophical Movement. To hasten the advent of that day with all that it implies, was the reason for the coming of H. P. Blavatsky among men, for her writing, teaching, working as she did, and for interjection into the language of Theosophy of so many Sanskrit terms and ideas. This because Sanskrit is no ordinary human development, but from Those, once human but no longer so, for whose doctrine no other vehicle is adequate.

"The introduction of English in India brought with it a new spirit in Sanskrit and new enthusiasm in Sanskrit scholars. Today every cultured land has a chair in Sanskrit in its universities. Once every two years a large number of research scholars meet in a Conference of Orientalists in India, and among them at least a hundred can be named who are doing active research and making substantial contributions to Sanskrit knowledge. The Conference includes many Persian and Arabic scholars who do excellent work at studying, preserving and publishing Persian and Arabic manuscripts to be found in India. Sanskrit, we believe, will not die, but will continue to lend itself through the centuries to those adaptations which serve for the betterment of mankind. Even though at the present moment nations of the world exhibit only casual interest, as time passes and the mad quest for

money-making loses its beauty they will be compelled to give more serious attention to Sanskrit."*

Today, marking the new phase of India's awakening, are to be recognized among her sons men of *will* and fixity of purpose, such as have not appeared on the Eastern scene for centuries. From the profusion of moral energy and emerging Manasic perception now evident in the Motherland of the Aryans, must come also a virility of thought and vigor of language that will ultimately parallel the developments of the Western world. And, as Sanskrit brings its philosophic dimensions to Western speech, so has the vigorous English of the erstwhile conquering race engrafted its energy on the parent stem. The spiritual rebirth of India must be counted in any attempt to determine how Sanskrit will "reincarnate."

Standing at the top of an enormous Sanskrit Indian literature, the source of all varieties of knowledge, religious, secular, scientific, mystic, are the *Vedas.* These are best known as the scriptures of the Hindus. The word is from the root *vid,* "to know," or "divine knowledge." The Vedas are the most ancient as well as the most sacred of the Sanskrit works. They are claimed by the Hindus themselves—whose Brahmans and Pundits ought to know best about their own religious works—to have been first taught orally for thousands of years and then compiled on the shores of Lake Manasarovara, beyond the Himalayas in Tibet. Each Veda, and almost every one of its hymns and divisions, is the production of various authors. They have been written at various periods of the ethnological evolution of the Indo-Aryan race. The Vedic writings are all classified in two great divisions, exoteric and esoteric, the former being called "division of actions or works" (*Karma-Kanda*), the latter, "division of (divine) knowledge" (*Jnana-Kanda*). Both departments are regarded as *sruti* or revelation. The Rig Veda is the first and most important of the four Vedas. To each of its hymns the name of the seer or Rishi to whom it was revealed is prefixed. It thus becomes evident on the authority of these very names (such as Vasishta, Viswamitra, Narada, etc.), all of which belong to men born in various manvantaras, that centuries, and perhaps millenniums, must have elapsed between the dates of their composition. The *Gayatri,* the most sacred hymn of the Rig Veda, is taken from the third of the ten cycles of hymns, the cycle of the Rajaputra Sage Viswamitra.

---

* *Sanskrit Culture in a Changing World.* B. Bhattacharyya.

In their *final* form, as compiled by Veda-Vyasa, the Brahmans unanimously assign 3,100 years before the Christian era, the date when Vyasa flourished. The primitive, purely spiritual language of the Vedas, conceived many decades of millenniums earlier, had found its purely human expression for the purpose of describing events taking place 5,000 years ago, the date of Krishna's death, from which date the Kali Yuga or Black Age began for mankind. Therefore the Vedas must be as old as that. But their antiquity is sufficiently proved by the fact that they were written in such an ancient form of Sanskrit, so different from the Sanskrit now used, that there is no other work like them in the literature of Sanskrit. Only the most learned of the Brahman Pundits can read the Vedas in the original.

The Vedas have a distinctly dual meaning—one expressed by the literal sense of the words, the other indicated by the metre and the intonation which are the life of the Vedas. The mysterious connection between intonation (*swara*) and *light* is one of its most profound secrets.

Attached to the Vedas are the Upanishads and the Brahmanas. The Brahmanas, Hindu sacred books, are commentaries compiled by the Brahmans on those portions of the Vedas which were intended for the ritualistic use and guidance of the "twice-born" (*Dwija*) or Brahmans. The Upanishads are to the Vedas what the Kabala is to the Jewish Bible. They treat of and expound the secret and mystic meaning of the Vedic texts. They speak of the origin of the universe, the nature of Deity, and of Spirit and Soul, as also of the metaphysical connection of mind and matter. They contain *the beginning and the end of all human knowledge,* but they have now ceased to reveal it, since the day of Buddha. The Upanishads are the priceless treasures of the Vedanta, but require now the additional possession of a Master-key to enable the student to get at their full meaning. The *Anugita* is regarded by translators as a continuation of the *Bhagavad-Gita,* and its original is one of the oldest Upanishads. It is stated by contemporary authority that, today, more than one hundred Upanishads have been published and that probably hundreds more await discovery and editing. Their literary range covers the gamut of "philosophical and legal works, grammar, history, the Epics and other classes of poetry, medical, lexical, polity, fable and romance, the science of poetics, the drama, tantra, astronomical, astrological and mathematical literature."

The alphabet and the art of writing were kept secret for ages, as the *Dwijas* (twice-born) and the Initiates alone were permitted to use this art (dictated by those anterior cycles and the condition of mankind). Therefore is the word *lipi,* "writing," absent from the oldest manuscripts, a fact which gave to the Orientalists the erroneous and rather incongruous idea that writing was not only unknown before the days of Panini, but even to that sage himself. That the greatest grammarian the world has ever produced should be ignorant of writing would indeed be the greatest and most incomprehensible phenomenon of all! Panini, called "the last of the Rishis," composed a grammar containing 3,996 rules, the most perfect grammar the world has ever known. This most elaborate and scientific of all systems, brought to perfection about 1440 B.C., consummated the era of "Vedic Sanskrit" by inaugurating that of Classical Sanskrit, thus bringing the Vedas into their final compiled form.

Dr. B. Bhattacharyya, Pandit Sanskritist of India, writes* that "... foreign hordes, and various trans-Himalayan tribes often succeeded in conquering parts of India, founding principalities and even empires; all of whom finding the influence of Sanskrit everywhere too strong, tried to destroy Sanskrit culture by destroying temples and monasteries, burning libraries, killing priests *en masse*.... But the wonderful power of Sanskrit resisted all these attacks, and whenever Pandits found breathing time they again started their teaching and studying, writing and copying of Sanskrit works, while under their advice the kings built temples and monasteries. The lately discovered Mohenjo Daro civilization, which is dated by European scholars at 3200-2800 B.C. and which is thus contemporaneous with the beginning of the Kali Yuga, was deeply influenced by the Vedic civilization, since at this period the Vedas were a settled fact."

Dr. Bhattacharyya continues:

> From time immemorial Sanskrit descended from father to son and from preceptor to disciple. Study was the duty of all classes except those who were fitted only for menial duties. Monetary considerations played no part in these schools. The teacher collected together boys in the village and taught them first the Vedas and then the useful Shastras (authoritative treatises, including law-books), and this irrespective of whether he received remuneration or not, because that

---

* *Sanskrit Culture in a Changing World.*

being his social and religious duty he was bound to render it to society. [Compare with what is written of the methods used by Pythagoras (Yavanacharya) in his school at Crotona.] Thus was Sanskrit language transmitted through the ages.

In the beginning the Guru used to recite the Vedas or the Shastras, and the disciple repeated, and later the disciple recited independently and the Guru corrected. This process went on for years—sometimes as many as eighteen years—until the disciple acquired enough knowledge and power. By this process memory developed to such an extent that the voluminous literature of the Vedas could be recited at one sitting, correct to the *last accent,* without ever opening a book or manuscript. When we remember that a printed edition of the Rig Veda alone covers more than a thousand pages, royal octavo, the feat of reciting the whole from memory will appear to anyone as stupendous and marvelous. Persons who can recite the whole of the Rig Veda from memory are still in existence in India amongst the Maharastrians, Nambudiris and Madrasis. And in like manner sciences, Shastras, grammar, lexicography were learnt. It is the kind of learning that produces really learned men. There was hardly any need for costly education in schools and colleges.

According to H. P. Blavatsky in her *Secret Doctrine,* the members of the several esoteric schools—the seat of which is beyond the Himalayas, and whose ramifications may be found in China, Japan, India, Tibet, and even in Syria, besides South America—claim to have in their possession the *sum total* of sacred and philosophical works in manuscripts and type: all the works, in fact, that have ever been written, in whatever language or characters, since the art of writing began; from the ideographic hieroglyphs down to the alphabet of Cadmus and the Devanagari. Let us then, advises Mr. Judge, get ready to use the material in this ancient storehouse of India, treasures that no man can be called a thief for taking, since the truths acquired by the mind respecting man's life, conduct, constitution, and destiny are the common property of the human race, a treasure that is lost by monopoly and expanded by dissemination.

In America and in India alike, there is a vast stirring and a preparation. No one can predict with certainty how or when will come the hoped-for union between East and West, nor the precise manner of the reciprocal osmosis of ideas and concepts that should bind these two great centres of civilization into a cultural whole. But unity there will be in spirit, philosophy, and language, whether centuries or even millenniums hence, just as the several lines of evolution will meet.

WORD PUZZLES

THE foregoing article, in repeating H.P.B.'s insistence on the need of the West for a philosophical language, invites reflection upon the paucity of philosophical terms in our dictionary vocabulary. For instance, if one browses through words beginning with "b," he will be hard pressed to find terms of much use to the philosopher. The pages are full of such designations as "bourbon whisky" "bowie knife" and "bordello," but these suggest other than philosophical interests. A slight bow to conventional piety is received by virtue of the inclusion of "boy scout," but even a boy scout is not expected to be, nor helped by Christianity to be, much of a metaphysician. There are, indeed, words having some religious connotation—but note what they are.

"Belief," earlier discussed, has connotations of value, but in common usage relates chiefly to *un*philosophical, sectarian attitudes. Belief has become, in fact, closely related through usage to *bias,* the adverbial form of which means "obliquely, diagonally; hence, awry." For the philosopher a belief is a projection of his heart's aspiration; for the average Westerner a form of prejudice. The word *bigot* also appears in close proximity, and here again we see the deterioration of meaning which has resulted from the dogmatic proclivities of Western peoples. Joseph Shipley's *Dictionary of Word Origins* provides an interesting footnote:

> *Bigot:* This word is suggested as a corruption of the exclamation *By God,* applied to those that often used it. But it is tangled in its history with the religious orders of the *Beguines* and the *Beghards* "and the *Bigutts*"—all of them originally terms of derision.

The *Beguines—if* the origin of bigot—seem to have done little to merit this slur, for they were simply "women united in piety," living communal lives, but unattached to orthodox convents. At this point it is difficult to determine whether their contemporaries disliked genuine piety so much that they made the "bigutts" objects of derision, or whether the movement actually exhibited closed-minded views. If *bigot* derives from *By God,* we can, however, certainly reason that a saving grace among philosophically impoverished Westerners has been an ability to detect and deprecate excessive closedmindedness—even if

not the personal brand possessed by the critic. How often does "common sense" penetrate the veils of typical cultural delusions, yet recoil, because of a lack of positive philosophical faith, from the strenuous activity involved in turning the critical gaze inward! And, to deride *other* people's biases or bigotries does not help matters much, unless suggestions along positive lines are offered at the same time, as in the writings of H. P. Blavatsky. James Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics,* by the way, contributes an excellent passage on *bigotry:*

> . . . denoting the moral characteristic which combines strong will with narrow intelligence in its direction. It appears sometimes in that lack of moral perspective which distinguishes the stickler for trifles, exalting trivial and variable forms into equal rank with the immutable principles of moral and religious life. Sometimes a strong will may grasp tenaciously even a doctrine or line of conduct that is wrong, and then we may have the cruel intolerance of an inquisitor or of the leaders in the Reign of Terror during the French Revolution. When a strong will is supported by religious enthusiasm, bigotry is well described as "a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge."

A further scanning of Webster's reveals that the only words under "b" suggesting positive, philosophical conceptions come to us from the East (with the possible exception of "brotherhood," and even here the term often denotes a partisan affiliation—"as a society of monks; a fraternity, guild, etc.; the whole body of persons engaged in the same business or profession; as, the legal *brotherhood*"). On page 102 of *Webster's New Collegiate* edition, we discover a good discussion of a philosophically conceived deity in definition of the word Brahma; "The supreme soul or essence of the universe, immaterial, uncreated, illimitable, timeless [but] often described as being, intelligence, and bliss." *Webster's* also makes clear that this conception of deity is entirely "neutral," an "impersonal spirit."

A *"Brahmin"* may be a doctrinaire and presumptuous person, but is *supposed* to be simply "a highly cultured person; an intellectual," whose refined subtleties of mind enable him to embody the philosophic temperament. The essence of *Brahminism* is said to consist of "pantheistic conceptions," while the caste system of India may be regarded as a cultural growth of secondary importance, since in any of its rigid forms it has no pantheistic justification.

Here are involved issues pertaining to the various shades of feeling attached to the championing of "intellectualism" or "anti-intellectual-

ism." The original meaning of *Brahmin* suggests that, rather than distrusting the acute intellect, the man of average mental powers was originally disposed to regard "intellectuals" as rightfully belonging to the highest natural class of society. But when intellectuals became priests, as did the Brahmins, and began to evidence self-gratulation and pride in the possession of special knowledge, there arose a need for revolutionaries like Kapila, who warned against accepting guidance from members of a *self-seeking* sacerdotal caste. So, today, general respect for "the intellectual" is offset by distrust.

The word Buddha finds encouraging definition in *Webster's:*

> Buddha. The title of an incarnation of self-abnegation, virtue, and wisdom, in the form of a religious teacher of the Buddhists who has been deified, esp. Gautama Siddhartha (563-483 B.C.), founder of Buddhism.

We are not quite sure what is meant by the "deification" of Buddha, since in its purest forms Buddhism recognizes that Gautama was but one of a long line of highly advanced yet entirely human teachers, yet in any case we do have here, quite clearly, a more philosophical definition of an Adept than that provided in respect to Jesus by Christians.

Such dictionary perusal, therefore, effectively highlights the contentions presented by the preceding article "The Waiting Vehicle," and makes less puzzling such sentences as the following:

> Sanskrit will one day be again used by man upon this earth, first in science and in metaphysics, and later on in common life. Terms now preserved in that noblest of languages will creep into the literature and press of the day, crop up in reviews, appear in various books and treatises. The language has been enriched by ages of study of metaphysics, for Sanskrit, in the days when it was a living tongue, was also the living vehicle of thought.

Even in such abbreviated volumes as Shipley's we discover that the etymologist must know something of Sanskrit in order to trace many psychological and philosophical terms to their ultimate origins. Thus the "pure" meaning—and the most useful meaning, from a theosophical point of view—is often suggested by study of the original Sanskrit word. "Desire," for instance, discussed in an earlier installment of this series, had in Sanskrit a neutral, psychological meaning. Only in the terms provided by Christian theology has "desire" been associated exclusively with "corruptions of the senses," with evil or degradation.

Noting the increasing attention now paid to the teachings of Eastern philosophies and religions by Western psychologists, we may predict that a greater number of Sanskrit terms will find their way into English usage with each decade, and that dictionaries will consequently be enlarged in a manner calculated to encourage a philosophical attitude of mind. We have read numerous elaborations of theory by anthropologists in regard to the growth of the human mind, holding that thought is the creation of language, entirely dependent upon language, and in one sense this contention would certainly seem to be valid. From the perspective of the etymologists, anthropologists and semanticists, an idea which cannot be expressed is no idea at all. That alone is Wisdom which can be communicated. Thus all sectarian utterances merely increase the amount of "bias" and "bigotry," and communicate nothing that widens the vision of man's spiritual brotherhood.

Albert Einstein once wrote that "restricting a body of knowledge to a small group deadens the philosophical spirit of a people and leads to spiritual paucity." Whether referring to the Brahmins, a medieval priesthood, or to a chosen few of atomic scientists, the truth of this statement is historically demonstrable. Whenever one leaves the conduct of affairs to the experts, unless these "experts" be those with whom one can hold daily communion, a situation finally develops in which the average man, apparently quite justifiably, disclaims responsibility for existing conditions. For this condition both the prideful "experts" and the common herd are to blame, though, and while the first group suffers all the results of arrogant isolation, the majority suffer from lack of philosophical terms as well as from the delusion of irresponsibility.

Whenever one discusses Karma or Reincarnation with a friend, he will find himself capable—if the listener is sufficiently interested—of endless reasonings and illustrations to bring out the subtle implications of these concepts. But when a theologian defines "doctrine" it is *simply* "defined," and there is an end to the matter. All of the copious intellectualizations of medieval times proceeded within the limits of arbitrary definitions, and did not encourage the participants to follow out truly original lines of speculation. *Every* Sanskrit word finding present usage in our own language can, on the other hand, be made a vehicle for original thought.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

TO what extent is a "virtuous life" also a Theosophical one?

To the extent that virtuous means morally pure, a virtuous life and a Theosophical one are close indeed. But a Theosophical life is more; it is a life governed by an unflinching faith in principles that are eternal, and which commend themselves eternally to rational discrimination.

While it can be said that many lead virtuous lives without engaging in philosophical deliberation, those benevolent souls who perform acts of grace almost instinctively and who exude a confidence and serenity much admired, are some day sure to be further tested. Perhaps it will be in the form of some great suffering to be endured, or a growing sense of futility, for who is to escape the accumulated Karma of the race?

Virtue is not complete without spiritual knowledge. As Krishna says in the fourth chapter of *The Bhagavad-Gita:* "Seek this wisdom by doing service, by strong search, by questions, and by humility." Those who, from pure motives, and by dint of strong search, set their lives to *search* with humility will not search in vain. The impetus will eventually carry them to Theosophy, wherein an enduring rational basis for "right ethics" can be found.

There are certainly many who, though never even hearing of Theosophy by name, are among the most noble and "virtuous" people one could ever want to meet. On the other hand, there are doubtless theosophical students whose virtues leave much to be desired when it comes to perfection in conduct. Then why join the Theosophists, one might justifiably ask, when virtue is found in abundance elsewhere?

At this point it is necessary to ask—why virtue? Does the naturally virtuous person know why he is good? All patterned goodness stems from habit and even good habits have their limitations from the standpoint of soul. Certainly nothing is wrong in virtue for virtue's sake, but the Theosophist is taught *why* virtuous motives and enlightened motives are one and the same thing. In this sense, the theosophical student has a better opportunity to avoid confusing *a* virtue with the status of the soul. Theosophy does make self-righteousness difficult.

The virtuous man may in the past have known the reason for so acting, in other words, he may have known Theosophy. This life, circumstances (Karma) are such as to make him a theosophist unaware.

As to the theosophist who is less virtuous than one knowing nothing about the soul-inspiring philosophy of life, at least he may be plagued by the protests of his mind against unvirtuous conduct.

With some there is an intuitive realization of the validity of Theosophic principles and ideals, although intellectually some may not "know" the philosophy well enough to adequately describe or explain the logic to anyone else. Conversely, an arm-chair philosopher or intellectual may have a nimble grasp of Theosophic doctrine and many of the intricacies involved in its theoretical development, yet fail to make it a living power in his life. How account for these discrepancies; and since even in the first instance there are genuine discrepancies, what price must be paid for the imperfections thus represented?

(*a*) It seems that some clarification is needed in determining what "discrepancies" are. As regards the first half of the question, that person must have developed appreciation of the "heart doctrine," while the other gravitated toward the intellectual. Both are obviously necessary. Growth can take place *only* through mind, but this must be Plato's "rational soul," or the Higher Mind. What we call "intellect," as Mr. Judge wrote, can be cold—tending toward the material. But this does not mean that intellect cannot be directed toward its true purpose, that of serving the soul of man.

History has recorded many instances of unlettered men who have made their mark as great humanitarians; and many other men whose powerful minds have served the cause of evolution even though their personal lives were not above reproach.

Both "heart" and intellect form a part of man's sevenfold nature and *ought* to be developed side by side so as to express a natural, equal unfoldment of the soul's powers.

(*b*) In the society of today, perhaps more than at any time in the past, people are suffering from mental ills. One of the main causes to which this is attributed is the age of specialization in which we live. Such a degree of technological advancement requires a high intellectual knowledge to carry it out, but the lives lived are unbalanced.

What applies to our physical way of life in this day applies also to our soul. Both theoretical and practical knowledge are necessary in

order to make a complete individual. A high degree of knowledge coupled with psychological understanding of life's problems is found in a Master of Wisdom. Here is a "well rounded individual" in the full sense of the phrase. Just as the greatest of men among scientists (those who can both theorize and put their theories into practice) try to uplift humanity and draw it onward to a higher development, so the Master of Wisdom does the same. His laws are the laws of Nature, the laws of the universe. His students are all humanity.

From the perspective of rebirth, we all have "specialized" tendencies from past lives, and until they are worked out—the practical with the theoretical, and *vice versa*—the student will not grasp the full implications of his study. A perception of the truths underlying intellectual understanding and the acquirement of an adequate language for communicating the fruits of soul experience are both necessary.

Why is it that some people, while recognizing the value of Theosophy, nevertheless feel that there are circumstances and conditions which occasionally absolutely prevent them from embodying the ideas in their lives?

Theosophy has value only when taken as basic principles for consistent action. A principle is not valid if there are exceptions to it. Despite the acceptance of this by the world in general, some person always feels that, in *this* particular case, an exception can be made because a strict adherence to principle wouldn't be "practical." The trouble with the world today is that there are too many "practical" people and nations, who feel that in *specific* cases their religious and ethical principles won't work to advantage and hence are by-passed. For instance, in the interim between the first and second world wars, school children were taught in their history classes that rearmament and militarism only led to war, rather than prevented it, yet at the same time their nations were and still are rearming—giving as their reason: "we can't take the chance of being caught unprepared." It seems that only when people as individuals are willing to take the "chance" one takes by living on principle, that they may change themselves and their nations for the better.

The value of Theosophy, as expressed in the Three Fundamental Propositions, is independent of circumstances. Of course, the question is concerned with the seeming hazards, at times the extreme difficulty, which may attend the decision to live according to the dictates of the

nobler instincts of Man. Socrates' questioning in the Athenian market-place led to the hemlock, Christ had to bear the cross, and in our own time Gandhi was similarly martyred. Are such lives "impossible"?

But perhaps the average traveler on the path will say that these sages cannot be accepted as paragons for the average "practical" man. They were inspired, and possessed of such spiritual and mental powers as make their life a thing apart. They knew the Truth from the very start of their incarnations; we must stumble along in a quasi-blindness for many incarnations before we attain to their levels.

These observations of the "practical" man obviously carry weight. The evils of Kali Yuga have been accumulating over thousands of years, and their dissolution is not to be accomplished by a single stroke. It is in the very midst of these circumstances and conditions, however, that a beginning must be made. Over past causes we have little control, though we can mitigate their effects; but over our future acts we are supreme. And, furthermore, we have many things to help us. We have, first of all, the great teachings of Theosophical messengers.

The very fact that a person comes into contact with Theosophy is apt to be an indication that he has been doing serious thinking on his own. He may already have come to the point where he sees fallacies in his previous beliefs, or at least questions their validity. The philosophy of Theosophy, being "a scientific religion and a religious science," makes a definite appeal to a logical mind. Without it the person may become a cynic and a doubter, as too many persons have become. But Theosophy encourages the replacement of all beliefs by knowledge.

It is often said that the good question is more important than its answer. Why?

What is the nature of the "good question"? The saying itself seems to imply something about the attitude of the questioner. Assuming that the ultimate object of asking questions is the attainment of wisdom, the acquisition of information is but a means to this end. So the good question is certainly one which stimulates thought, to begin with, or, better still, one which represents an attempt to synthesize knowledge already gained with new facts or possible relationships. In other words, the questioner does not expect that the answer he receives will put his mind forever at rest. An "answer" is merely a step, a new point of departure for further questioning on his part.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PROMISES

AMONG men of deep honor, the keeping of a promise is valued more highly than life itself. While men everywhere respect this virtue with at least lip service, and reward its violators with criticism, few manifest the courage to fulfill a trust undertaken, and many lightly promise that which they never mean to do. If men are "as *good* as their word," in Kali Yuga there are few "good" men. "I have come to the conclusion," wrote Wm. Q. Judge, "that in this nineteenth century a pledge is no good, because everyone reserves to himself the right to break it if he finds after a while that it is galling, or that it puts him in some inconsistent attitude with something he may have said or done at some other time." Does the twentieth century have higher standards?

Mere enumeration of the familiar reasons, however tenable, for keeping one's word, does not seem to bring a marked change in people's habits. Everyone can see that wars result when nations break their solemn treaties; that unfaithfulness in marriage leads to divorce; that businesses cannot operate successfully unless contracts are kept, unless employees keep their obligations to be punctual, industrious.

Looking more deeply into the matter, it would appear there is an amazing fact about a promise which, when understood, provides the scientific rationale for such integrity and thus transforms this virtue into a pressing moral need. In the usual course of action, under the universal law of Karma, one must earn merit before receiving compensation. By making a promise, however, one gains something in the present, for which he *has to pay* in the future. You go to a bank and obtain a loan. You have not yet earned that money, but on the basis of a promissory note (necessarily supported in our day of low morality by collateral or reliable reference) you receive now that which must be earned in the future.

If one thus analyzes any promise whatsoever—an affirmation to a friend, the pledge of a disciple to his teacher, even a promise to oneself—it will invariably be discovered that something *has been received in advance,* intangible though it may sometimes appear, which would not have been his without this verbal warranty. He has thereby immediately placed himself under debt, and never can be free until the

promise is redeemed. If the salesman, politician, priest, or professional advertiser knew with certainty that the spirit, if not the letter of every promise, must be fulfilled, would he not count the cost before rashly mortgaging his future? When someone *takes* your word, perhaps part of you goes along as a guarantee!

Even the making of noble resolves to oneself can at times be a selfish and deceiving habit. People enjoy the feeling of satisfaction that accompanies such resolving. They find themselves the recipient of energy from supernal sources, which inspires to high hopes and enthusiasm. If such vows are not translated into action one is in the dishonorable position of having received uplift without making recompense. Such debts are to one's own Divine Self, which being one with Nature's LAW, forgets not, nor pardons nor releases.

These considerations may help point up the scientific foundation for honorable action. They should lead, it is hoped, to a realization that a higher, nobler reason exists for the keeping of covenants than trepidation at the *personal* incurring of Karmic debts. The whole of life is degraded when we say "I will," and then fail to fulfill. Perhaps in the following valuable observations from *Isis Unveiled* a glimpse of the nature of a higher motivation may be afforded:

> We sincerely believe that the better portion of humanity will ever bear in mind that there exists a moral code of honor far more binding than an oath, whether on the *Bible, Koran,* or *Veda.* The Essenes never swore on anything at all, but their "ayes" and "nays" were as good and far better than an oath. . . . Oaths will never be binding till each man will fully understand that humanity is the highest manifestation on earth of the Unseen Supreme Deity, and each man an incarnation of his God; and when the sense of *personal* responsibility will be so developed in him that he will consider forswearing the greatest possible insult to himself, as well as to humanity. No oath is now binding, unless taken by one who, without any oath at all, would solemnly keep his simple promise of honor.

Here, to quote a poet, "buds the promise of celestial worth."

Neither heavenly nor earthly, neither mortal nor immortal have we created thee, so that thou mightest be free according to thy own will and honor, to be thy own creator and builder. To thee alone we gave growth and development depending on thy own free will.

—PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA

ON THE LOOKOUT

Tribute to a Modern Saint

There is much to interest Theosophists in the fact that the *Saturday Review* (June 13, 1953) featured a "cover" photograph and lead article on "The Problem of Ethics for 20th Century Man," by the modest sage, Albert Schweitzer. Here is a man who "stepped out of sunlight into shade" to provide more light for others. Dr. Schweitzer, when he went to Africa on a mission of conscience in 1913, fully expected to give up all public prestige in theological, academic and musical circles. "Karma," however, decreed otherwise, for though Schweitzer was willing to be obscure in order to help a suffering native population, he has nonetheless now gained international veneration. That this should take place, incidentally, is a source of never-ending wonder to him; it is also evidence that men of broad and noble genius sometimes *are* recognized for their moral worth even by publishers and the "literary" public.

Ennoblers of a Faith

In 1877, H. P. Blavatsky set a tone for consideration of one variety of "Christian," alluding to "those whose sinless lives reflect the glorious example of that Prophet of Nazareth, by whose mouth the spirit of truth spake loudly to humanity." In the Preface to the second volume of *Isis Unveiled,* she says:

> Such there have been at all times. History preserves the names of many heroes, philosophers, philanthropists, martyrs, and holy men and women; but how many more have lived and died, unknown but to their intimate acquaintance, unblessed but by their humble beneficiaries! These have ennobled Christianity, but would have shed the same lustre upon any other faith they might have professed—for they were higher than their creed.

H.P.B. points out that there have always been those whom sure faith, simple piety and compassion for their fellowmen have raised above any creed. Her classic example, as we know, is Father Damien (*Key to Theosophy,* "On Self-Sacrifice"), but there are contemporary examples also.

One of these, John Tettemer, (formerly Father Ildefonso) was mentioned in Lookout for November, 1952. Another is Albert Schweitzer,

whose birth occurred in the same year as that of the Theosophical Society—1875. Both Tettemer and Schweitzer labored for a time within the fold of orthodox Christianity, the one as a monk, the other as an ordained minister; both discovered that the limitations of dogma raised unnecessary barriers between man and fellowman; each eventually developed a philosophy of action in accord with his nature and his own particular genius. Tettemer was led "to live apart from the church as simply a respected counselor to his many friends"; Schweitzer went as a medical doctor to equatorial Africa.

Self-Sacrifice with Discrimination

In the *Key,* H.P.B. says that "self-sacrifice has to be performed with discrimination," suggesting that it might be better to work among the "Christian savages" at home than to go into the mission field. But all previous efforts to serve in ordinary ways and through established channels had ended in frustration for Albert Schweitzer. He needed, he said, "an absolutely personal and independent activity." Hence, when the desperate need of a doctor at one of the African missions came to his attention, he eagerly prepared himself for service. To others—"people who passed for Christians"—it seemed an act of insanity that a man who had already made a name for himself should, at the age of thirty, enter Medical College in order to "bury himself among savages." But Schweitzer held fast to his decision because he felt himself "to be equipped by temperament for such a course, even if it meant having to face an eventual failure of my plan."

Ethics versus Dogma

Accordingly, when Dr. Schweitzer had received his medical degree and had raised sufficient funds to finance his project, he applied to the Paris Missionary Society for permission to go *at his own expense* and "merely as a medical doctor" to its station at Lambarene. (The desperate plight of this mission had aroused his interest.) His offer was at first rejected because of his "unorthodox views," even though his sole interest was in saving lives and in mitigating suffering. Eventually however, all members of the Board capitulated save one, who resigned rather than give up his demand for orthodoxy! Dr. Schweitzer explains his persistence as follows:

> I was tempted to persist in getting a decision on the question whether, face to face with the Gospel of Jesus, a missionary society

could justifiably arrogate to itself the right to refuse to the suffering natives in their district the services of a doctor, because in their opinion he was not sufficiently orthodox.

"Duty is that which is Due to Humanity"

Schweitzer realized that, for most people, heroism consists in doing the small, plain duties that lie nearest. As he puts it:

> Only a person who can find value in every sort of activity and devote himself to each one with full consciousness of duty has the inward right to take as his object some extraordinary activity instead of that which falls naturally to his lot. Only a person who feels his preference to be a matter of course, not something out of the ordinary, and who has no thought of heroism, but just recognizes a duty undertaken with sober enthusiasm, is capable of becoming a spiritual adventurer such as the world needs.

Should a Shoemaker Always Stick to his Last?

Dr. Schweitzer's first "vacation" from Lambarene was necessitated by World War I. He and his wife were sent to an internment camp at Garaison, which was in charge of "a theosophist, who carried out his duties not only with fairness but with kindness."

Soon after their arrival, some newcomers were transferred from another camp. They at once began complaining about the cooking (which was then being done by professional cooks) and insisted that they could do it better—although not one was a cook! On being allowed to try their hand at the cooking, they "lost no time in demonstrating their ability." When Dr. Schweitzer asked for the secret of their success, the chief "cook" (who had been a shoemaker) replied: "One must know all sorts of things, but the most important is to do the cooking with love and care." Mindful that "love and care" *may* make up the difference between failure and success in any venture, Dr. Schweitzer remarks:

> So now, if I learn that once more someone has been appointed minister of some department about the work of which he knows nothing, I do not get as excited over it as I used to, but screw myself up to the hope that he will prove just as fit for his job as the Garaison shoemaker proved to be for his.

Ethics for Twentieth Century Man

Albert Schweitzer—philosopher, musician, humanitarian—is today a man who, at the age of 78, is still directing his now adequately equip-

ped and staffed hospital at Lambarene, writing articles, and trying to complete his *Philosophy of Civilization,* the first two volumes of which have been published. (On each vacation from Lambarene, Dr. Schweitzer has lectured at universities in Europe, Scandinavia, and the British Isles—giving organ recitals by the way. He has been invited by Harvard to deliver the Lowell Lectures.)

In the *Saturday Review* article, Dr. Schweitzer compares and contrasts the various philosophies of China, India, Greece, and Europe in relation to their conception of the world and its influence on ethics. He then sets forth his own philosophy of ethics, from which we quote:

> The ethics of devotion through compassion no longer has the character of a law which we should like to continue to attribute to it. It no longer involves clearly established and clearly formulated commandments. It is fundamentally subjective, because it leaves to each one of us the responsibility of deciding how far he shall go in devotion.
>
> Not only does the ethics of devotion cease to prescribe in a precise fashion; it becomes by degrees less disposed to confine itself to the realm of the possible, as the law must do. It is constantly obliging us to attempt the impossible, to push devotion to the point of compromising our very existence.
>
> The man who has preserved his sensibility intact finds it altogether natural to have pity for all living beings. Why can philosophy not make up its mind to recognize that our behavior toward them must form an integral part of the ethics which it teaches? The reason is quite simple. Philosophy fears, and rightly so, that this immense enlargement of the circle of our responsibilities will deprive ethics of the slight hope it still has of being able to formulate commandments in a way that is at all reasonable and satisfying.

Reverence for Life

Dr. Schweitzer has worked out a personal philosophy that might well be expressed as conviction of "the fundamental identity of all souls with the Universal Over-Soul." In his words:

> The fundamental idea of good is thus that it consists in preserving life, in favoring it, in wanting to bring it to its highest value, and evil consists in destroying life, doing it injury, hindering its development.
>
> The principle of this veneration of life corresponds to that of love, as it has been discovered by religion and philosophy which sought to understand the fundamental notion of good.
>
> The term "respect for life" is broader and because of this more colorless than that of love. But it bears the same energies within it.

> This essentially philosophical notion of good has also the advantage of being more complete than that of love. Love includes only our obligation toward other beings, but not those toward ourselves. One cannot deduce from it, for example, the quality of veracity, a primordial quality of the ethical personality along with that of compassion. The respect which man owes to his own life imposes upon him that he be faithful to himself by renouncing every kind of dissimulation to which he might be tempted to resort in a given circumstance.
>
> Through respect for life we enter into a spiritual relationship with the world. All the efforts undertaken by philosophy which built up grandiose systems to bring us into relation with the Absolute have remained vain.

Theosophist Unaware

From *Out of My Life and Thought,* (Dr. Schweitzer's autobiography, from which our background material is taken), there emerges, we think, the portrait of a man of compassion comparable to Father Damien—whom H.P.B. declared "a living exemplar of Theosophical heroism." The portrait, shows him also to be, in the words of a friend, a "tender and fun-loving man, who at meal time kept the whole table laughing at joke after joke which he told."

Albert Schweitzer's life and work might perhaps be best explained by a passage from H.P.B.'s "Genius" (Theosophy 41: 167):

> The cultivation of certain aptitudes throughout a long series of past incarnations must finally culminate in some one life, in a blooming as *genius,* in one or another direction.
>
> Great Genius, therefore, if true and innate, and not merely an abnormal expansion of our human intellect—can never copy or condescend to imitate, but will ever be original, *sui generis* in its creative impulses and realizations.

It has been asserted by the teachers of Theosophy that, as a philosophy, it meets these basic requirements. The student is encouraged by study and application to check, test, and prove the validity of this assertion, thus tending away from the dangers of religionism or sectarianism.

A Stone Idol

In the February issue of Theosophy, mention is made of the posthumous publication of the letters and manuscripts of Colonel P. H. Fawcett, who in 1925 set out in vain to find a legendary lost city in the

interior of Brazil. It would be difficult to overestimate the significance of this publication, which, though often seeming an almost endless repetition of the hardships and trials of jungle experience, nevertheless reveals the author's own belief in occultism and magic, also telling of the magical practices of the inhabitants of that ancient land. Says Col. Fawcett:

> I have in my possession an image about ten inches high, carved from a piece of black basalt. It represents a figure with a plaque on its chest inscribed with a number of characters, and about its ankle a band similarly inscribed. It was given to me by Sir H. Rider Haggard, who obtained it from Brazil, and I firmly believe that it came from one of the lost cities.
>
> There is a peculiar property in this stone image to be felt by all who hold it in their hands. It is as though an electric current were flowing up one's arm, and so strong is it that some people have been forced to lay it down. Why this should be I don't know.
>
> Experts at the British Museum were unable to tell me anything about the idol's origin.
>
> "It's not a fake," I was told, "it's quite beyond our experience."

The Science of Psychometry

In spite of the learning of our experts, present-day scientists know little or nothing of the "ultimate structure and properties" of matter. Neglecting the unseen side of nature, the majority cut themselves off from a perception of the laws governing such phenomena—and, perforce, drive open-minded searchers like Col. Fawcett into channels of research and investigation which are unforgivably "unscientific." In the Colonel's writings we find these notes on psychometry:

> I could think of only one way of learning the secret of the stone image, and that was by means of psychometry—a method that may evoke scorn from many people, but is widely accepted by others who have managed to keep their minds free from prejudice. Admittedly, the science of psychometry is yet in its infancy in our western countries, though highly developed in the Orient . . . It is based on the theory that every material object preserves in itself the record of its physical vicissitudes, and that this record is available to a person sensitive enough to tune in to the particular vibrations involved.

A Strange Journey

> I was quite unknown to the psychometrist, who held the figure in one hand and in complete darkness wrote the following:

"I see a large irregularly shaped continent stretching from the north coast of Africa across to South America . . .

"I seem to be transported across the country to the western side. The country is hilly, and elaborate temples are partly hewn from the faces of the cliffs, their projecting facades supported by beautifully carved columns. Processions of what look like priests pass in and out of these temples, and a high priest or leader is wearing a breast plate similar to the one on the figure I am holding. Within the temples it is dark, but over the altars is the representation of a large eye. The priests are making invocations to this eye, and the whole ritual seems to be of an occult nature, coupled with a sacrificial system, though whether human or animal I cannot see.

Black Magic?

"Placed at various parts of the temple are a few effigies like the one in my hand—and this very one was evidently the portrait of a priest of high rank. I see the high priest take it and hand it to another priest, with instructions to retain it carefully, and in due course deliver it to an appointed one, who in turn must pass it on until at length it comes into the possession of a reincarnation of the personage it portrays, when numerous forgotten things will through its influence be elucidated . . . by a great many of them the black arts are practised to an alarming extent."

Through the discovery, or rediscovery, about one hundred years ago, of the faculty of *psychometry,* Prof. J. R. Buchanan made a most valuable contribution to the psychological sciences of this era. Without realizing, perhaps, the significance of his own words, Buchanan stated: "This discovery, in its application to the arts and to history, will open a mine of interesting knowledge." Psychometry is a phase of clairvoyant power which rests upon the theory that the whole of material Nature—animate and inanimate—is permeated by a universal tenuous medium called the *Astral Light.* This medium, it is held, photographs, retains, and, under the proper conditions, gives up the records of every past event, however near or remote in time or space. Holding the object in hand, or placed against the forehead, the psychometer catches, with his *inner eye,* the living pictures of the past.

Theopoea

"We know that from the remotest ages," says H. P. Blavatsky, "there has existed a mysterious, awful science, under the name of theopoea." The passage in *Isis Unveiled* continues:

This science taught the art of endowing the various symbols of gods with temporary life and intelligence. Statues and blocks of inert matter became animated under the potential will of the hierophant.

The *celestial,* pure fire of the Pagan altar was electrically drawn from the astral light. Statues, therefore, if properly prepared, might without any accusation of superstition, be allowed to have the property of imparting health and disease by contact.

The same knowledge and control of the occult forces, including the vital force which enabled the fakir temporarily to leave and then re-enter his body, and Jesus, Apollonius, and Elisha to recall their several subjects to life, made it possible for the ancient hierophants to animate statues, and cause them to act and speak like living creatures.

KEY TO UNSOLVED MYSTERIES

Whether Col. Fawcett's image is, indeed, a relic of the "black arts," affecting evilly all those who touch it, or a faithful guardian of the hidden treasures of the past, who can say? But, in the solemn words of the psychometer, one thing seems certain: ". . . it is a maleficent possession to those not in affinity with it, and I should say it is dangerous to laugh at it . . ." Says the Colonel:

. . . whatever its story may be, I look on it as a possible key to the secret of the Lost City of my quest, and when the search is continued it will accompany me. The connection of Atlantis with parts of what is now Brazil is not to be dismissed contemptuously, and belief in it—with or without scientific corroboration—affords explanations for many problems which otherwise are unsolved mysteries.

PERFUME, YET

Despite an apparent liberalization of Catholic attitudes, the officials of Rome still let themselves go once in a while as in days of yore. An AP dispatch from Vatican City (Nov. 21) gives the text of a special prayer to Mary, composed by Pope Pius "for use during the Marian Year." Portions of it—in the official Vatican translation—read as follows:

Though degraded by our faults and overwhelmed by infinite misery, we admire and praise the peerless richness of sublime gifts with which God has filled you, above every other mere creature, from the first moment of your conception until the day on which, after your assumption into heaven, he crowned you queen of the universe.

O crystal fountain of faith, bathe our minds with the eternal truths! O fragrant lily of all holiness, captivate our hearts with your heavenly perfume! O conqueress of evil and death, inspire in us a deep horror of sin which makes the soul detestable to God and a slave of hell!

We note particularly the appeal to "captivate our hearts with your heavenly perfume," to which is later added the suggestion that Mary "bend tenderly over our aching wounds." Erich Fromm's discussion of the psychological orientation of authoritarian religion is here documented, for all that is evil and weak is found by this prayer in man, while all that is good or joyful—or even sufficiently perfumed—belongs to a sphere quite beyond us. By glorifying God, or Mary, *in this particular way,* we resign ourselves to continuing as the sort of creatures we have talked ourselves into becoming.

Ancient Tablets Deciphered

The *Manchester Guardian* of Oct. 15, 1953, published a short monograph by R. D. Barnett, of the British Museum, on the Minoan tablets unearthed at Knossos in Crete by Sir Arthur Evans in 1896, and attributed to circa 1400 B.C. Although Sir Arthur was able to show from these tablets that three stages of writing existed in Crete, the inscriptions on the tablets could not be deciphered—save enough to show that "these tablets were mainly inventories and accounts, not religious or literary texts."

A Hobby Pays Off

In 1935, Michael Ventris (then a schoolboy) heard Sir Arthur lecture. Stirred by the challenge the tablets offered, he decided to make an attempt to decipher them his hobby. By 1952, Ventris had come to the conclusion that the latest of the three types of Cretan writing, designated "Linear B," "must conceal a form of Greek."

"This conclusion," says Mr. Barnett, "was not altogether new, but his treatment of it was." He continues:

> The script which emerged proves singularly ill fitted for writing Greek, but this is probably because it was invented originally for writing not Greek but Minoan, and was taken over by the Achaeans for their language, just as the Semitic Babylonians took over for their language the cuneiform script which the latter had invented for their own tongue.
>
> From these tablets an early dialect of Greek has emerged, significantly like that of Homeric Greek. . . . But if these tablets are Greek, two points arise. First, they are the earliest contemporary record of any Indo-European language. Second, they make it possible that some form of bardic poetry may have existed before the fall of Troy, as

Homer himself suggests. Clearly, both the study of Homer and of the Greek dialects and language must now be reopened from their foundations.

GREEK IRON AGE

Mr. Barnett continues:

> In the Iron Age the lost art of writing had to be reintroduced by the importation from Phoenicia of the alphabet. In Cyprus, however, a form of the Minoan syllabary survived until Hellenistic times, and it is worth noting that nearly a score of its signs and values are identical with those of Linear B as now interpreted. Much more work on these tablets will now be needed. The work has only begun.
>
> But the most gratifying fact is that Ventris has at last rung up the iron curtain which for long cut Greek archaeology into two apparently disconnected halves—a Bronze Age, Mycenean, but virtually pre-Greek, and a Greek Iron Age. They are now seen to be all one.

GREAT ANTIQUITY OF WRITING

H. P. Blavatsky comments at length in *The Secret Doctrine* on the efforts of philologists and historians to fit known "facts" into a chronology inspired by the Bible. She wrote (*S.D.* II, 439):

> Every archæologist and palæontologist is acquainted with the ideographic productions of certain semi-savage tribes, who from time immemorial have aimed at recording their thoughts symbolically. This is the earliest mode of recording events and ideas. . . . Rocks in Iran and Central Asia are *covered with writing,* two and three thousand years old (12,000, according to some fearless palæontologists).
>
> Writing was an *ars incognita* in the days of Hesiod and Homer, agreeably to Grote, and unknown to the Greeks so late as 770 B.C.; and the Phœnicians who had *invented* it, and knew writing as far back as 1500 B.C., at the earliest, were living among the Greeks, and elbowing them, all the time! All these scientific and contradictory conclusions disappeared, however, into thin air, when Schliemann discovered (*a*) the site of ancient Troy, whose actual existence had been so long regarded as a fable; and (*b*), excavated on that site earthenware vessels with inscriptions *in characters unknown* to the palæontologists and the all-denying Sanskritists. . . .
>
> The truths of to-day are the falsehoods and errors of yesterday, and *vice versa.* It is only in the XXth century that portions, if not the whole, of the present work will be vindicated.

These Minoan tablets and the exposé of Piltdown Man are among the vindications.

Emerson Re-evaluated

In the Summer issue of the *American Scholar,* Stephen E. Whicher, associate professor of English literature at Swarthmore College, considers "Emerson's Tragic Sense." This essay, as the title suggests, examines a single facet of Emerson's character: a study of the "unusually large gap, even contradiction, between his teachings and his experience." Mr. Whicher, in this essay, abstracts several examples of such "gaps" from Emerson's writing and lectures, and considers their psychological implications.

Mr. Whicher's recent book on Emerson, however, *Freedom and Fate* (University of Pennsylvania Press)—reviewed by Joseph Wood Krutch in the *Nation* for last Nov. 14—analyzes Emerson's *thought.* In *Freedom and Fate,* says Dr. Krutch, "the thought is subjected to a detailed and rigorous analysis, . . . and in the process changes of opinion are carefully separated from the genuine inconsistencies which persist through it all."

Emerson and the Present Generation

"Certainly," says Dr. Krutch, "the Spirit of the Age which he [Emerson] hoped to embody has turned against him: who, outside of college courses, reads him now?" Is this because Emerson has nothing to say to the present generation, or because contemporary ears (dulled by apathy and pessimism) are unable to hear?

After a critical consideration of Mr. Whicher's book, Dr. Krutch continues:

> If much in this review, as in the book under consideration, seems destructive, it is because the review, following the method of the book, attempts to pin Emerson down, and that is impossible without doing a good deal less than justice to a man whose achievement was not a system but a mood, a temperament, and a personality expressing themselves vividly if not consistently in eloquently phrased aperçus. What is left for us to learn from is not the dogmatic premises of his thought but its spirit and its intention. And from that we can learn much. . . .
>
> At the very least Emerson's excesses are the opposite of ours. We are so familiar with boundless pessimism that we ought at least to be reminded that boundless optimism is possible. We have so low an opinion of human nature that it is good to know that an extravagantly high opinion has been held. Above all, we may be reminded that lack of faith in oneself can be overdone.

THEOSOPHICAL EVALUATION

A Theosophical consideration of Ralph Waldo Emerson as a "Precursor of H.P.B." may be found in THEOSOPHY (24: 1, 49). In this article, the same *facts* stressed by Mr. Whicher are noted, but a distinctively Theosophical construction is put upon them:

> In the Library at Concord, Massachusetts, there stands a bust of the American philosopher, Ralph Waldo Emerson. The face of this bust is asymmetrical. That is to say, if the face is viewed from two different angles, it presents the appearance of two different men.
>
> This physical characteristic seems to permeate the whole of Emerson's nature. If we look at his mind from two different angles it, too, seems to belong to two different men. . . . He is, in other words, a living example of that law which he so consistently taught throughout his life—the law of opposites. Everything in the Universe, he says, is dual; everything has its opposite. And it requires the union of these two opposites to make the perfect whole.
>
> And so, taking him at his word, we must unite the two seeming opposites in Emerson's nature if we would understand the man as a whole. . . . But even to regard Emerson as a whole is not enough. In order to really understand him, we must look at him as a part of a still larger whole. . . . His lifework must be considered in its relation to the Theosophical Movement.
>
> He helped to re-establish the five thousand year cycle by bringing back the words of Krishna in the *Bhagavad-Gita.* He linked that cycle with the twenty-five hundred year cycle by turning the mind of the West back to Plato and the Buddha. . . . Through calling attention to the work of the Alexandrian School, he strengthened the fifteen hundred year cycle—the cycle of reincarnation. Uniting these three links into a chain of perfect continuity, he paved the way for the Teacher in whom all three cycles converged—H. P. Blavatsky, the Messenger of 1875.

EVALUATIONS AGREE

Freedom and Fate, says Dr. Krutch, "is probably as complete an exposition and as searching a criticism as we are likely to have." Mr. Whicher concludes from his critical analysis of Emerson's work:

> It is not true that he has nothing to say to us. Emerson believed in the dignity of human life more unreservedly, almost, than anyone who has ever written. . . . We think more meanly now, no doubt more truly, of ourselves and our world. But as long as we retain any self-respect, something in us must answer—whatever the second thoughts—to the faith in man that invigorates every page of these volumes. To reject Emerson utterly is to reject mankind.